UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/634,435	08/08/2000	Shiann-Jong Hu	JA999802	4383

7590 09/30/2003

HOFFMAN, WARNICK, D'ALESSANDRO LLC
THREE E-COMM SQUARE
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
GARG, YOGESH C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/634,435	HU, SHIANN-JONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yogesh C Garg	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04/29/03 & 06/4/03* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *19-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *19-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *22* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment D, paper number 19, received on 04/29/2003and response, paper # 21, received on June 04, 2003 are acknowledged and entered. Claims 19, 32 and 38 are amended. Currently claims 19-38 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. With reference to the applicant's remarks, see amendment page 9, and amendment made to claim 19, rejection of claims 19-31 under 35 USC § 101 is withdrawn.

With reference to the applicant's remarks, see amendment pages 9-10, and amendment made to claim 32, rejection of claims 32-37 under 35 USC § 112 is withdrawn.

With reference to the applicant's remarks regarding rejection of claims 19-20, 22, 24-31, and 32-37 under usc.103 (a) as unpatentable over Zeanah in view of Freund (see amendment pages 10-12) is now based upon the amended limitation " after the unique banking transaction has been mistakenly processed " which raises new issues which would require further consideration and search and as such the arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection Zeanah and Schmidt et al. (US Patent 6,006, 229).

With reference to the applicant's remarks regarding "Main module" concerning claims 19, 32, and 38 (see amendment pages 12-13, the examiner observes that the applicant has not responded to the arguments forwarded in the earlier Office action, see pages 2-3 and reproduced below:

"Applicant's arguments filed with respect to " A The Main Module" regarding claims 19 and 32 on 11/15/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues

that Zeanah does not teach " a main module for initiating an application transaction based on a banking transaction ". The examiner does not agree. Zeanah discloses " a main module for initiating an application transaction based on a banking transaction ". The session controller component 131 in Zeanah corresponds to the main module; see FIG. 2. Zeanah teaches that applications for the "delivery system 12" can be written in any language which supports the object model; an application is a set of components that does specific business functions, such as cash withdrawal and may comprise several components; different components may be implemented in different languages and as an example, Visual Basics, C++ and Java may be used in implementing the components of the delivery system, see col.28, line 41-col.29, line 19. Zeanah's delivery system 12 comprises a session services set 130 which includes a session controller component 131 and this session controller component 131 manages all the sessions in the delivery system 12 and initiates application transactions based upon a banking transaction, see col.18, line 39-col. 20, line 27. Since Zeanah discloses the use of C++ language the following factors would be inherent: programs written in C++ language invoke the main module first, which then calls the other application programs. C++ programming is object oriented creating objects from classes. C++ software is packaged in classes such that the classes are the components of the software system. These classes can be reused again and again. Each class contains data as well as the set of functions that manipulate the data ".

In view of the above the rejection of claims 19, 32, and 38 is maintained.

With regards to the applicant's remarks regarding amended claim 32, " system processing functions" (amendment page 13), they have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection necessitated due to amendment.

The examiner observes that with regards to "Centercut control module and online report module" concerning claims 26-27 and 33-34, (see amendment page 14)", the applicant has

accepted the fact that the functionality provided by these modules is known as submitted in the earlier Office action. The applicant has further remarked that Office does not make a prima facie showing that providing the functionality in modules is known but without providing any evidence. Since the applicant has not provided any evidence in traversing the rejection the arguments are not considered persuasive and therefore the rejection is maintained.

In view of the foregoing the rejection of claims 19-38 is maintained. This is a final rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19-20, 22, 24-31, and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeanah, and further in view of Schmidt et al. (US Patent 6,006,229), hereinafter referred to as Schimdt.

With regards to claims 19-20, 24-25, 28, 32 and 35, Zeanah teaches a system for developing a processing banking transactions system comprising a plurality of terminals for generating messages, wherein each message requests a banking transaction (col.5, line 41-col.6, line 10, ".. *The invention is described with reference to a system 10 for use by the bank....system 10 includes a delivery system 12 for providing financial services to a variety of remote devices....*", and col.6, line 58-col.7, line 8, "..*The touch point interface services set 40 provides an interface....includes a touch point interface component 41.....is responsible for*

managing the link/session level protocols with remote device...notifies the session services set 130 to start a new session on initial contact from a remote device.....also encodes messages in the interface protocol, sends messages to the touch point services set 50...". Note: In Zeanah remote devices and delivery system correspond to a plurality of terminals and banking platform respectively, in the application):

a business platform, stored on at least one computer, including:

a set of application transactions, wherein each application transaction can process a unique banking transaction (see at least col.28, line 41-col.29, line 19, " *....A component in the delivery system 12.....An application.....is a set of components that does a specific business function, such as cash withdrawal* ").

a main module for initiating an application transaction based on a banking transaction (The session controller component 131 in Zeanah corresponds to the main module; see FIG. 2. Zeanah teaches that applications for the "delivery system 12" can be written in any language which supports the object model; an application is a set of components that does specific business functions, such as cash withdrawal and may comprise several components; different components may be implemented in different languages and as an example, Visual Basics, C++ and Java may be used in implementing the components of the delivery system, see col.28, line 41-col.29, line 19. Zeanah's delivery system 12 comprises a session services set 130 which includes a session controller component 131 and this session controller component 131 manages all the sessions in the delivery system 12 and initiates application transactions based upon a banking transaction, see col.18, line 39-col. 20, line 27. The customer regardless of a particular remote device accesses the delivery system 12 though the touch point and display component 31 which notifies the session controller component 131 and thereafter the session controller component 131 instantiates various components based upon a banking transaction,

see, col.4, lines 24-28, "...A navigation shell component notifies the remote device of the list of available functions, such as cash withdrawal or bill payment...". Since Zeanah discloses the use of C++ language the following factors would be inherent: programs written in C++ language invoke the main module first, which then calls the other application programs. C++ programming is object oriented creating objects from classes. C++ software is packaged in classes such that the classes are the components of the software system. These classes can be reused again and again. Each class contains data as well as the set of functions that manipulate the data.).

a message formatter module for providing data on a banking transaction based on a message requesting the banking transaction and the formatter interfaces with a transaction definition table that defines the input fields for each banking application and stores converted data into a transaction field table (col.24, line 53-col.26, line 29, ".....The vehicle for import and export preferably is ELF formatted messages that can be defined in an AGS data dictionary and received and sent by AGS applications. These messages may be defined to be composed by the persistent global variables and tables that comprise the necessary context such that no data manipulation is required in AGS after receipt of the import message...The level one application receives the message and updates session context and persistent global memory.....Using the transaction type code,....applicable state code received in the context data....level to application creates and sends the exit message to invoke level three application appropriate to the transaction type....);

a database interface module for providing a platform independent interface between the main module and at least one database ((abstract, "..*The system and method provide state-of-the art interfaces with interface components and support legacy applications with legacy app bridge components* ". In Zeanah " Bank's internal computer system and bank's books" are banking databases. See col.1, lines 42-45, "..*Banks developed internal computer systems*

...staff terminals.....bank tellers could access the books of the bank when they were entering, customer transactions.....". Zeanah discloses that acquirer component 114, which is called by the session component [the main module] can access any of the databases, see col.28, lines 20-24. It will be understood that in order to communicate with whatever database a database independent interface module will be inherent in the system and interdependent interface modules were already known and being in use at the time of the invention, see Goldberg et al. (US Patent 6,076,0902, [see at least abstract, col.2, lines 9-23, FIG.4, FIG.6, col.5, line 34-col.7, line 17]. This patent reference is quoted to demonstrate that the concept of independent interface modules to access one or more databases was already known.).

an external interface module for providing a platform independent interface between the main module and the terminals (col.3, line 51-col.4, line 13, "*...Thus, the system provides a single base for interfacing with all types of remote devices* ", col.4, lines 1-13, "*..In generating graphic interfaces, the system and method preferably separate content from format to accommodate variations in the remote devices....the system and method can provide state of the art user interfaces.....custom-design a user interface*", col.6, line 58-col.7, line 60, "*...and The touch point interface services set 40 provides an interface.....includes a touch point interface component 41.....The presentation manager component 52 also encodes the resulting page in the device specific format for the particular remote device.....component 51* ", col.29, lines 22-35. Note: devices corresponds to terminals.);

a file interface module for providing a platform independent interface between the main module and a file system of the at least one computer based on the set of definition files wherein each file defines a set of properties for a file (abstract, "*..The system and method provide state-of-the art interfaces with interface components and support legacy applications with legacy app bridge components* ", col.23, line 40-col.24, line 3, "*..A fundamental advantage*

of the delivery system 12 is the independence of one mini-app dialog component 83 from another.....The mini-app dialog component 83 also includes a rule file.....rule engine file....rule database file....language file....template file...." . It is understood that in order to access the different files a file interface would be existing and independent interface modules were already known and being in use at the time of the invention, see Marsh et al. (US Patent 5,930,831, [see at least abstract, col.1, lines 25-30, FIGS 4-10,]. This patent reference is quoted to demonstrate that the concept of interdependent interface modules to access one or more file systems based on the set of file definition files was already known.).

A set of knowledge blocks, wherein each knowledge block can perform a unique banking operation, wherein at least one application transaction uses at least one knowledge block to process the unique banking transaction and a set of common functions, wherein each common function performs a unique business function, and wherein at least one knowledge block uses at least one common function to implement the unique banking operation (Note: Both Knowledge blocks and common functions are software codes such that an application calls a knowledge block code to implement a banking transaction and the knowledge block calls a common function code to implement a banking operation. So does Zeanah teach, see col.28, line 41-col.29, 19. Zeanah discloses that application is a set of components which correspond to knowledge blocks or objects and objects, as inherent in C++ programming contain a set of functions.

a set of system processing functions for providing a platform independent interface between the business platform and the at least one computer (col.28, lines 58-63 discloses supporting distribution and sharing aspect in legacy system interfaces and that corresponds to the claimed limitation); and

an interface that allows user to add each of new application transaction and a new knowledge book (col.28, lines 49-col.29, line 5, "*.....The IDE should also support a tool " plug-in" capability to allow tools to be added....test tools...software distribution tools.....middleware.....*" . Note: Knowledge Block, as analyzed above is a software code. Zeanah discloses adding new application and other software programs).

Zeanah does not disclose to undo the unique banking transaction after the unique banking transaction has been mistakenly processed. However, the concept and benefits of using undo operation in software modules is old and well known. Schimdt teaches to undo the unique banking transaction after the unique banking transaction has been mistakenly processed (see at least col.7, lines 26-45, "...In the preferred embodiment, the Xbase transaction management means 31 is implemented as a log file for each client 25 or 25'. As Xbase commands that will change the underlying Xbase file set 5 are received...changes are not made and reflected ...until a commit op code is received. If a rollback is received instead of a commit, the transaction log is simply discarded...". Note: The rollback operation corresponds to undoing a banking transaction if it is mistakenly processed. See the illustration in col.3, line 43-col.4, line 34). In view of Schimdt, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the undo feature in Zeanah. Doing so will enable the system in Zeanah to totally disregard the unsuccessful transactions-due to computer (s) failure, or for any other reason-and to guarantee that the results of only wholly completed transactions are permanent (committed) and the other transactions are rolled back, as explicitly stated in Schimdt (see at least, col.5, lines 17-27, "....to undo the partial transaction....either duet to a unintentional programming bug, or an operator error or....").

With regards to claim 22, Zeannah/Schimdt further discloses accounting application servers, wherein each accounting application server processes an accounting entry, and

wherein at least one application transaction generates at least one accounting entry (col.12, line 8, " *account component 115* ", col.17, lines 19-35, "*..The account component 115 supports query of account information and supports update of account information....*". *Also see col.5, line 64-col.6, line 10, "....or through an application server,....home services delivery system (HSDS),..disclosed in US Pat. No. 5,485,370....is hereby incorporated by reference....*".).

With regards to claims 26-27, and 33-34, functions of batch processing of banking transactions and reporting to other banks and consumers are inherent in banking. To support the inherency of these functions in banking please refer to US Patent 6,122,625 (col.34, lines 37-45, " *an Issuing Bank 1 may record the details of transactions being performed during the course of the day for later batch processing* ", and col.35, lines 23-33, "*..It is contemplated that all issuing banks 1 will provide a report reflecting their position at the end of a specified period...*") enclosed with this Office Action.

With regards to claims 29 and 36, Zeannah/Schimdt further discloses that each terminal is selected from a group consisting of: an automatic telling machine, a teller terminal, a point-of-sale terminal, a credit card machine, and a personal computer (col.3, lines 60-67, "*...The remote device may comprise any type of device, such as a personal computer, screen phone, ATM .....internal staff terminal.....system provides a single base for interfacing with all types of remote devices*". Note: a point-of-sale-terminal is covered under "all types of remote devices" in Zeannah.).

With regards to claim 30, Zeannah/Schimdt also discloses including a testing driver for simulating a terminal (col.9, lines 35-36, " *and a test-manager component 78* ", and col.11, lines 12-26)

With regards to claims 31 and 37, Zeannah/Schimdt also discloses that each business transaction is selected from a group consisting of " a current deposit, a fixed deposit, a withdrawal, a loan, a settlement, a credit card transaction, a debit card transaction, accounting, electronic remittance, and clearance (col.14, lines 43-54, ". *The transaction services set 90.... needed to accomplish particular business functions...Some examples .....are withdrawal component, deposit component, transfer component, transaction journal component, get payee list component, update payee list component, and make a payment component...*", col.16, lines 5-13, "*..The customer ID component 111 has card information, if a card was used, including the type of card, such as ATM, credit card, Smart Card and tracks present ...data...deposit only flag.....links to account list..*", col.17, lines 19-35, "*..The account component 115 contains information and can answer any questions about a particular account.....The individual accounts may be customer owned or payee accounts that can be target of a transfer or bill payment..*", also col.2, lines 31-30-37. Note: As stated, this list of applications is an example and the applications like loan, settlement, and clearance would be inherent part of banking applications. Zeanah explicitly discloses that financial services are delivered to remote devices including ATM, PDA...(col.3, lines 51-67) and that would include electronic remittances).

5. Claims 21, 23 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeanah/Schimdt, and further in view of Korth et al. (Text Book, " Database system concepts " McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, Copyright © 1991, 1986).

With regards to claim 21, Zeanah/Schimdt teaches a system for developing a processing banking transactions system comprising a plurality of terminals for generating messages, wherein each message requests a banking transaction as disclosed in claim 19 and analyzed above. Zeanah/Schimdt further discloses the use of databases. In Zeanah/Schimdt " Bank's

internal computer system and bank's books" are banking databases, see Zeanah col.1, lines 42-45, "..*Banks developed internal computer systems ...staff terminals.....bank tellers could access the books of the bank when they were entering, customer transactions.....*". US Patent 5,485,370 is incorporated by reference in Zeanah/Schimdt, col.6, line 65-col.6, line 1. See Pat' 370, col.7, lines 20-34, and FIG.1,". *A plurality of .....financial service computer systems 20 (a-d)....are themselves ..host computers running database access systems* ".) One of Zeanah/Schimdt's objects of invention is that external platforms should be able to access the bank's databases through a common Interface-see Zeanah, col.2, line 58-col.3, line 48, see specially col.3, lines 39-42, ".. ...*Thus a need exists for a computer system or method that has a .....offers access to various remote devices.....expansion of access to new types of devices..*". Zeanah/Schimdt further discloses the common interface to access banking databases (see at least Zeanah FIG.1-element 41, col.4, lines 28-34, *"..To coordinate communications.....a touch point interface component routes ....and an external service provider...*", and col.6, line 58-col.7, line 8). Zeanah/Schimdt further discloses the use of search engine in accessing the databases (see at least Zeanah, col.12, lines 43-53, ".. *The navigation shell components 82 .....include a search engine of natural language searching capabilities..*").

Though Zeanah/Schimdt discloses a data dictionary (see at least Zeanah, col.25, lines 13-15), does not show defining data requirements and a generator that can automatically generate a data layout based on the data dictionary, wherein the data layout is used by the business platform. However, elements like data dictionary and use of data dictionary to generate layouts for retrieving data from a database are common practices followed in database management systems.

Korth teaches a data dictionary that defines data requirements and a generator that can automatically generate a data layout based on the data dictionary; wherein the data layout is

used for retrieving required data (at least see pages 1-12, 15, 17, 216 and 235-236. note: Korth has used Banks data base access systems as examples in the book). In view of Korth, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in Zeanah/Schimdt's Bank's computer systems, to use data dictionary in a database scheme and to generate automatically a data layout based on the data dictionary to be used by a business platform in Zeanah/Schimdt. Dong so would enable database management system in the " Bank's computer systems in Zeanah/Schimdt " to define a set of definitions for the database scheme and store this metadata about the structure of the database and authorization information in a tabular form to be consulted before reading or modifying actual data, as suggested by Korth (at least see page 12, under the head, " 1.6 Data Definition Language ", pages 15, 17, 216 and 235-236).

With regards to claim 23, Zeanah/Schimdt teaches Zeanah teaches a system for developing a processing banking transactions system comprising a plurality of terminals for generating messages, wherein each message requests a banking transaction as disclosed in claim 19 and analyzed above. Zeanah/Schimdt further discloses the use of databases. In Zeanah/Schimdt, " Bank's internal computer system and bank's books" are banking databases, (see at least Zeanah, col.1, lines 42-45, "*..Banks developed internal computer systems ...staff terminals.....bank tellers could access the books of the bank when they were entering, customer transactions.....*". US Patent 5,485,370 is incorporated by reference in Zeanah, col.6, line 65-col.6, line 1. See Pat' 370, col.7, lines 20-34, and FIG.1,". *A plurality of .....financial service computer systems 20 (a-d)....are themselves..host computers running database access systems* ".) and as analyzed in claim 21.

Zeanah/Schimdt does not disclose a set of skeletons, wherein each skeleton includes common processing logic for implementing a desired function, and wherein the interface allows a user to modify each skeleton. However, elements like skeletons and skeleton tables and use of them were common practices in QBE data manipulation language and the database systems and are still being used by IBM's Query Management Facility (see Korth, page 121, " 4.2 Query-by-Example...4.2.1 Basic Structure.....Queries in QBE are expressed using skeleton tables.....).

Korth discloses a set of skeletons, wherein each skeleton includes common processing logic for implementing a desired function, and wherein the interface allows a user to modify each skeleton (at least see pages 121-134 under the head, " 4.2 Query-by-Example....4.2.1 Basic Structure....4.2.8 Modifying the Database...". Note: Korth has used Banks data base access systems as examples in the book). In view of Korth, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in Zeanah/Schimdt's Bank's computer systems, to use a set of skeletons, wherein each skeleton includes common processing logic for implementing a desired function, and wherein the interface allows a user to modify each skeleton. Dong so would help to avoid cluttering the display with all skeletons and instead use those skeletons needed for a given query and fill them, as suggested by Korth (at least see page 121, under the head, " 4.2.1 Basic Structure ").

With regards to claim 38, limitations are written in function method with parallel limitations to those in claims 19-31 and are therefore rejected by the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh C Garg whose telephone number is 703-306-0252. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn W Coggins can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Yogesh C Garg

Examiner
Art Unit 3625

YCG
Sep 23, 2003.

Jeffrey A. Smith
Primary Examiner